DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 086 UD 021 689

AUTHOR Perez, Carmen A.; And Others
TITLE Report on the Educational Programs for Students of Limited English Proficiency in the State of New York.
INSTITUTION New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of Bilingual Education.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; *Bilingual Education; *English (Second Language); *Enrollment; Federal Programs; Mathematics Achievement; *Program Effectiveness; Reading Achievement; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; *Limited English Speaking; *New York

ABSTRACT

This report provides statistics on the number of New York State students enrolled in bilingual programs, the characteristics of these programs, and the achievements of students enrolled. A description of funded programs for limited English proficient (LEP) students show the numbers of students enrolled and the language groups served. A discussion of bilingual program characteristics outlines instructional components, teacher characteristics, and entry-exit criteria for students. Tables reveal the level of student achievement in reading and mathematics skills and achievement gains in oral language scores. The report concludes with several recommendations for program improvement. An appendix lists and describes the State and Federal programs for students of limited English proficiency. (Author/APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208086

Report on the Educational Programs for Students of Limited English Proficiency in New York State

The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
Bureau of Bilingual Education
Albany, New York 12234

1980

2

U 021689

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Carmen A. Perez
New York State Education Dept.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

REPORT ON THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Presented to the Regents of the
University of the State of New York

Prepared by
The Bureau of Bilingual Education
October 1980

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
Regents of The University (with years when terms expire)

1988	WILLARD A. GENRICH, Chancellor, LL.B., L.H.D., LL.D., Litt.D., D.C.S., D.C.L.	Buffalo
1988	J. EDWARD MEYER, Vice Chancellor B.A., LL.B.	Chappaqua
1986	KENNETH B. CLARK, A.B., M.S., Ph.D., LL.D., L.H.D., D.Sc.	Hastings on Hudson
1983	HAROLD E. NEWCOMB, B.A., LL.D.	Owego
1982	EMLYN I. GRIFFITH, A.B., J.D.	Rome
1983	MARY ALICE KENDALL, B.S.	Rochester
1984	JORGE L. BATISTA, B.A., J.D., LL.D.	Bronx
1986	LAURA BRADLEY CHODOS, B.A., M.A.	Vischer Ferry
1987	MARTIN C. BARELL, B.A., I.A., LL.B.	Kings Point
1984	LOUISE P. MATTEONI, B.A., M.A. Ph.D.	Bayside
1987	R. CARLOS CARBALLADA, B.S., L.H.D.	Arcade
1988	FLOYD S. LINTON, A.B., M.A., M.P.A., D.C.L.	Miller Place
1988	SALVATORE J. SCLAFANI, B.S., M.D.	Staten Island
1982	MIMI LIEBER, B.A., M.A.	New York
1985	SHIRLEY C. BROWN, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.	Albany

President of The University and Commissioner of Education
GORDON M. AMBACH

Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education
JOSEPH J. BLANEY

Deputy Commissioner for Elementary, Secondary and Continuing Education
ROBERT R. SPILLANE

Assistant Commissioner for General Education and Curricular Services
MARIA RAMIREZ

Director, Division for Curriculum Services
EDWARD T. LALOR

Chief, Bureau of Bilingual Education
CARMEN A. PEREZ

FOREWORD

This report was prepared as a response to a request from the Board of Regents to provide data on the number of students enrolled in bilingual programs, the characteristics of these programs, and the achievement of students enrolled.

The report is composed of the following sections:

I. Description of Funded Programs for Limited English Proficient Students, Including Numbers of Students and Language Groups Served

II. Characteristics of Bilingual Programs in New York State

III. Effectiveness of Bilingual Programs

IV. Summary and Recommendations

This report was prepared by the following persons:

Carmen A. Perez, Chief, Bureau of Bilingual Education
Peter M. Byron, Supervisor, Bureau of Bilingual Education
Nicholas S. Argyros, Associate, Bureau of School and Categorical Programs
Michael M. Fennell, Associate, Bureau of Bilingual Education
Enid Audinot, Assistant, Bureau of Bilingual Education

For additional information, please contact the Bureau of Bilingual Education at 518: 474-8775.

ABSTRACT OF REPORT ON THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
FOR STUDENTS OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY
IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

I. MAJOR QUESTION:

What are the student outcomes of bilingual programs in New York State in oral language proficiency in English and native language; in reading in English and in mathematics in English?

II. STUDENT SAMPLES:

The research was conducted independently with the following samples:

a. Oral Language Growth: Chapter 720 Programs (1978-1979). Thirteen school districts (K-12) N-1295. The sample included Hispanic, Italian, Greek, Portuguese, Chinese, South East Asian and Lebanese students. Approximately two-thirds of the pupils were from Spanish-language backgrounds with approximately 75% of the students enrolled for two years or less in schools where the language of instruction was English.

b. Title I/PSEN Summary of Criterion Test Results (1978-1979). Data submitted annually to the State Education Department (K-12) through the Local Educational Agency Programs (LEAP) evaluation report in reading and mathematics skils in English were analyzed to compare skill mastery gains between limited English proficiency (LEP) students and the school population at large. The sample included representatives of varied language groups with the largest percentage from Spanish-language backgrounds.

c. Review of Elementary Level Title VII and Chapter 720 Evaluation Reports (1978-1979). Evaluation reports submitted by 50 ESEA Title VII and 18 Chapter 720 projects at the elementary or middle school levels were analyzed to determine student outcomes in reading and mathematics achievement in English. The sample included representatives from many language groups with the largest percentage from Spanish-language backgrounds.

d. Review of Secondary Level Title VII and Chapter 720 Evaluation Reports (1978-1979). Evaluation reports submitted by 20 high school bilingual projects which served Spanish, Italian, Chinese, Arabic, Haitian-Creole and Yiddish. The largest percentage of students were from Spanish-language backgrounds.

III. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

There are currently no approved State regulations for programs for students of limited English proficiency. While each bilingual education program must by definition use two languages (native language and English) for instruction, the two languages are used in many different ways by the different programs. Generally, the requirements of the funding sources used to support a program dictate the types of programs which are implemented. Described below are models for the most common programs for students of limited English proficiency in elementary and secondary schools.

1. Bilingual Education (grades 1-6)

Elementary school bilingual programs normally follow a model in which the use of the native language decreases as each student's skills in English increase. This type of program helps students to acquire skills in subject areas such as mathematics, science and social studies through the language they understand best, while they are acquiring proficiency in English. As the student's English language ability develops, subject-area instruction through English is increased, and the use of the native language is decreased. The speed at which the student moves from bilingual instruction to monolingual English instruction usually depends on the student's progress in developing English language proficiency.

2. English as a Second Language (ESL Only) (grades 1-6)

In school districts in which there are not sizeable numbers of children from the same non-English language background, districts offer only English as a second language (ESL) instrution. Students receive ESL instruction on the average of one hour a day. In most cases students receive instruction in language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science in the monolingual English-speaking classroom.

3. Bilingual/ESL (grades 7-12)

Depending on the numbers of students from the same language background, bilingual or ESL-only instruction is given. Where there are sizeable numbers of students from the same non-English language background a bilingual model similar to that used in the elementary school is followed. Where many different language groups are represented by a few students in each group, such students receive intensive ESL instruction and all content areas are taught in English.

IV. ASSESSMENT

Test instruments included standardized and criterion measures in the English language. Test selection was made by project directors through the determination of their individual project evaluations.

V. RESULTS OF STUDY

a. Oral Language Growth: Chapter 720 Programs (1978-79)

1. In English, the average oral language score for all the sample increased from 52.0 to 70.2 in a six month period between the pre- and posttests.

2. For students taking both the pre- and posttest, the average gain in oral English was 20 points.

b. Title I/PSEN Summary of Criterion Test Results (1978-79).

1. A review of the five English reading skill categories (phonetic analysis, structural analysis, vocabulary, comprehension, study skills, and total reading) revealed that limited English proficient students enrolled in bilingual or ESL Title I programs demonstrated skill mastery equal to that of the Title I population at large.

2. Limited English proficient students surpassed the general population in the mastery of the subskills of structural analysis, vocabulary, and study skills as tested in English.

3. Limited English proficient students demonstrated a comparable level of mastery in mathematics to that of the Title I population at large on the mathematics skills of numbers, operation and applications; geometry; measurement; statistics and probability; sets; functions and graphs; problem solving; and total math, as tested in English.

4. Mastery for the limited English proficient group in the bilingual program exceeded the percentage of mastery for the population at large in the skill areas of numbers, operations, and applications; geometry; measurement; and problem solving.

c. Review of Title VII and Chapter 720 Evaluation Reports 1978-79 (Elementary)

1. Significant gains in English reading achievement were reported for 22 of 35 Title VII and Chapter 720 elementary school programs.

2. Significant gains in mathematics when measured in English were reported for 13 of 22 Title VII and Chapter 720 elementary school programs.

d. Review of Title VII and Chapter 720 Evaluation Reports 1978-79 (Secondary)

1. Attendance by students in bilingual programs exceeded that of the school population in the English monolingual programs in 17 of the 20 Title VII high school bilingual programs.

2. Dropout rates for students enrolled in bilingual programs were less than for monolingual high school students in all areas of the Title VII bilingual programs reporting dropout rates.

3. A higher percentage of students in the bilingual program were accepted at colleges than in the total school population in seven of the nine Title VII bilingual programs reporting college entrance information.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

A review of the findings of the four studies indicates the positive achievement of limited English proficient children in oral language development, reading, and mathematics as tested in English. The findings substantiate higher attendance, lower dropout rates and a higher college admission level than seen in English monolingual comparison groups.

The implications are that the programs serving limited English proficient students in the State of New York demonstrate positive accomplishments in both affective and cognitive domains.

VII. MAJOR REFERENCES

Carmen A. Perez, Peter M. Byron, Nicholas S. Argyros, Enid Audinot and Michael M. Fennell. Report on the Educational Programs for Students of Limited English Proficiency in the State of New York, Albany, New York. Bureau of Bilingual Education, New York State Education Department, 1980.

REPORT ON THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS
OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY
NEW YORK STATE

I. Description of Funded Programs for Limited English Proficient Students, Including Numbers of Students and Language Groups Served

Section 3204 of the New York State Education Law allows schools to offer instruction in a language other than English for a period of three years and, with the approval of the Commissioner, for a period not exceeding six years. Such bilingual programs must include instruction in English as a second language while subject area instruction (e.g. science, social studies and mathematics) is provided in the student's native language. New York State Education law does not allow instruction exclusively in a child's native language when that language is not English.

Currently the two types of approaches used to teach students of limited English proficiency (LEP) are English as a second language (ESL) and bilingual education. School districts are free to select either approach. Factors which influence the type of program a district uses include: funding available, local attitudes, community expectations, and the availability of resources.

Bilingual education for LEP students is an education program which uses two languages for instruction. Its goal is to allow LEP students to progress in academic subjects through instruction in their native language until they acquire the degree of English proficiency which will allow them to receive all instruction in English. All bilingual programs must have an English as a second language component. English as a second language (ESL) uses a variety of techniques and methodologies designed to develop English language proficiency among speakers of languages other than English. LEP students in an ESL-only program receive instruction in English as a second language and instruction in academic subjects in English.

Bilingual programs may be implemented through any one or a combination of local, State and Federal funding sources. Each funding source issues regulations specifying the type, level and intensity of activities authorized. A requirement common to all funding sources is that some instruction be given in English. Three Federal and two State programs provide most of the funds for programs for students of limited English proficiency.

Chart 1 shows the funding sources currently in use, the method of distribution, the languages, the numbers of students served by each source, and the types of services provided under each. The chart indicates the diversity of sources providing funds for educational services to limited English proficient students. Such programs in New York provided services to more than 127,000 students in 1978-79. Although students from 29 language backgrounds were served, the 11 language groups for which bilingual programs were funded were: Chinese, Japanese, Russian, Greek, Korean, Arabic, Mohawk, Seneca, Spanish, Italian and French/Creole. Programs for students in the 18 remaining language groups received funding for English as a second language only.

CHART I
FUNDED PROGRAMS FOR LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY STUDENTS
INCLUDING NUMBERS OF STUDENTS AND LANGUAGES
1979-1980

Funding Source	Number of Students	Languages	Types of Funding	Authorized* Services
ESEA TITLE I (Federal)	49,988	Spanish, Italian, French, Greek, Hebrew, Vietnamese, Haitian/ Creole, Arabic, Portuguese, Korean, Russian, Yiddish, Japanese, Cantonese, Mandarin, Farsi, Armenian, Polish, German, Turkish, Burmese, Albanian, Mohawk, Seneca, Urdu, Ukranian, Laotian, Cambodian	Formula Aid	Administrative Instructional Support
ESEA TITLE I MIGRANT (Federal)	597	Algonquin, French, Spanish	Formula Aid	Administrative Instructional Support
ESEA TITLE IV-C (Federal)	1,673	Spanish	Competitive	Administrative Instructional Support
ESEA TITLE VII (Federal)	46,349	Spanish, Italian, Haitian/Creole, Cantonese, Mandarin, Chinese, Arabic, Portuguese, Japanese, Seneca, Mohawk, Korean, Greek, French, Russian, Hebrew, Yiddish	Competitive	Administrative Support
Indochina Refugee Assistance Act (Federal)	3,062	Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laotian	Formula Aid	Instructional Support
Chapter 241 PSEN (State)	23,023	Languages same as Title I	Formula Aid	Administrative Instructional Support
Chapter 720 (State)	12,188	Spanish, Italian, Haitian/Creole, Seneca, Chinese, French, Greek	Competitive	Instructional

*See Appendix A

II. Characteristics of Bilingual Programs in New York State

A. Instructional Program Characteristics

There are currently no approved State regulations for programs for students of limited English proficiency. While each bilingual education program must by definition use two languages (native language and English) for instruction, the two languages are used in many different ways by the different bilingual programs. Generally, the requirements of the funding sources used to support a program dictate the types of programs which are implemented. Described below are models for the most common programs for students of limited English proficiency in elementary and secondary schools.

1. Bilingual Education (grades 1-6)

Elementary school bilingual programs normally follow a model in which the use of the native language decreases as each student's skills in English increase. This type of program helps students to acquire skills in subject areas such as mathematics, science and social studies through the language they understand best, while they are aquiring proficiency in English. As the student's English language ability develops, subject-area instruction through English is increased, and the use of the native language is decreased. The speed at which the student moves from bilngual instruction to monolingual English instruction usually depends on the student's progress in developing English language proficiency.

For example, a LEP student entering a bilingual program at the second grade may go through the following schedule over a three-year period:

FIRST YEAR

Subject	Language
Language Arts	Native Language
Science	Native Language
Mathematics	Native Language
Social studies	Native Language
English as a Second Language	English
Physical Education, Music and Art	English

SECOND YEAR

Subject	Language
Language Arts	Native Language
Science	Native Language
Mathematics	English
Social Studies	Native Language
English as a Second Language	English
Physical Education, Music and Art	English

THIRD YEAR

Subject	Language
Language Arts	English
Science	English/Native Language
Mathematics	English
Social Studies	English/Native Language
English as a Second Language	English
Physical Education, Music and Art	English

2. English as a Second Language (ESL Only) (grades 1-6)

In school districts in which there are not sizable numbers of children from the same non-English language background, districts offer only English as a second language (ESL) instruction. Students receive ESL instruction on the average of one hour a day. In most cases students receive instruction in language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science in the monolingual English-speaking classroom.

3. Bilingual/ESL (grades 7-12)

Depending on the numbers of students from the same language background, bilingual or ESL-only instruction is given. Where there are sizable numbers of students from the same non-English language background, a bilingual model similar to that used in the elementary school is followed. Where many different language groups are represented by a few students in each group, such students receive intensive ESL instruction and all content areas are taught in English language.

B. Teacher Characteristics

The Board of Regents has approved bilingual and English as a second language teacher certification for implementation in September, 1983. Currently bilingual teachers are licensed in New York City and Buffalo through licensing examinations. New York City also licenses English as a second language teachers. The most current data available on bilingual teachers in the State appears in the 1978-79 Public School Professional Personnel Report issued by the Information Center on Education.

As shown on Chart 2, in 1978-1979 2,884 teachers were reported as teaching in bilingual programs. Of those teachers, fewer than twenty percent held a B.A. as their highest degree, while approximately eighty percent reported education ranging from a B.A. plus 30 hours to the Doctorate. Eighty-seven percent of the bilingual teachers reported holding permanent or life certification in some area, while eleven percent reported five-year provisional certificates.

CHART 2

BILINGUAL TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS
1978-1979

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PRESENTLY TEACHING IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN NEW YORK STATE

Locations	Number	Percent
New York City	2,635	91.0
Buffalo	35	.01
Rest of State	214	7.0
Total	2,884	

DEGREE STATUS

Less Than B.A.	B.A.	B.A.+ 30 or more hrs.	M.A.	M.A.+ 30 or more hrs.	Doctorate
0.1%	19.8%	14.3%	38.1%	26.6%	1.0%

CERTIFICATION STATUS

None	5 Year Provisional	Permanent or Life
0.6%	10.6%	87.1%

C. Entry-Exit Criteria in Federal, State and New York City Programs

Criteria for admission to and exit from Federal and State bilingual/ESL programs are contained in Federal and State legislation. Admission and program exit criteria in New York City are defined in the Aspira Consent Decree.

1. Entry Criteria

a. Federal-ESEA Title VII

According to Federal regulations (Public Law 95-561-Nov. 1, 1978), in order to qualify for admission to a Title VII bilingual program, a student must be determined to be limited English proficient and must meet at least one of the following criteria:

. The student was not born in the United States.

. The student's native language is other than English.

. The student comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant.

. The student is American Indian or Alaskan Native and comes from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on his/her level of English language proficiency.

In addition to the above, the student must be found to have sufficient difficulty in understanding, speaking, reading or writing the English language to deny him or her the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English. The Federal regulations further state (Section 123a24) that the student's proficiency in speaking English must be assessed on an individual basis, and that overall assessment of the student must include a determination of proficiency in all four of the English language skills: understanding, speaking, reading and writing.

b. State - New York State Education Law Section 3204

According to New York State Education Law, programs in which both English and the second language are used for instruction are for students:

"...who, by reason of foreign birth, ancestry or otherwise, experience difficulty in reading and understanding English." (New York State Education Law Section 3204.)

c. New York City

New York City schools are under a court order requiring standards for admission to bilingual programs as follows:

"Those children scoring at or below the 20th percentile on the Language Assessment Battery (LAB) English test will be classified as having difficulty with the English language and, therefore, entitled to the provisions set forth in the Consent Decree and Special Circular No. 114."

2. Exit Criteria

a. Federal-ESEA Title VII

ESEA Title VII requires that program applicants evaluate "...the students' progress in improving their English language skills." (Section 123a.23). Program applicants are required also to demonstrate a reasonable time schedule and cost-effectiveness for: "The transfer of these children to instructional programs not funded under the Act." (Section 123a.20).

The Federal provisions for moving children from bilingual programs are further delineated in the regulation requiring schools which receive this funding to:

- Set measurable goals for determining when children enrolled in a program of bilingual education no longer need assistance in developing proficiency in English; and

- Conduct an evaluation of each child who has been enrolled in a program of bilingual education for two years to determine if the child should remain in the program (Section 123a.45).

III. Effectiveness of Bilingual Programs

The absence of statewide regulations standardizing the evaluation of programs for students of limited English proficiency and the variety of funding sources, each with its regulations regarding program, evaluation, and entry/exit requirements, make it difficult to generalize the relative effectiveness of particular types of programs. Furthermore, there is a critical shortage of standardized native language instruments with which to measure growth or achievement in subject areas taught in the native language or in English as a second language. For some languages, there are virtually no such standardized instruments.

For the purpose of this report, the evaluation data available for each of four of the funding sources was summarized and is reported separately. The conclusions reported are applicable to each of the programs discussed.

Program effectiveness information presented in this report has been secured from evaluation data for ESEA Title I/PSEN, ESEA Title VII and Chapter 720, as well as from a study that is being conducted by the Bureaus of Bilingual Education and School and Categorical Programs Evaluation, entitled Oral Language Growth in Chapter 720 State Funded Programs (K-12). The preliminary findings of the study are presented in this report.

A. TITLE I/PSEN SUMMARY OF CRITERION TEST RESULTS 1978-79 (K-12)

Test results for Title I/PSEN students are submitted annually to the State Education Department through the Local Educational Agency Programs (LEAP) evaluation report. Criteron-referenced pre- and posttest scores in reading and mathematics skills for 1978-79 were analyzed to compare skill mastery gains between limited English proficient (LEP) students and the school population at large.

A review of the five English reading skill categories revealed that limited English proficient students enrolled in bilingual or ESL Title I programs demonstrated percentages of skill mastery comparable to that of the Title I population at large. Limited English proficient students surpassed the general population mastery in the subskills of structural analysis, vocabulary, and study skills as tested in English. There is also a slight percentage advantage for LEP students in overall English reading skills. A description of gains appears in Table 1.

TABLE I

PERCENT OF PUPILS PASSING READING SKILLS OBJECTIVES
COMPARISON OF LEP PUPILS AND TOTAL TITLE I POPULATION
(CRITERION REFERENCED TEST RESULTS FOR 1978-79)

Skill Category	Total Population N	%	LEP Population N	%
Phonetic Analysis	68,634	75	19,601	72
Structural Analysis	41,116	69	6,311	73
Vocabulary	32,929	70	5,563	75
Comprehension	92,011	66	7,891	63
Study Skills	7,172	66	271	70
Total Reading	241,862	70	39,637	71

A similar comparison was made for all eight mathematics skill categories. In all cases, with the exception of logical thinking, for which there was insufficient information, the LEP students in the bilingual program demonstrated a comparable percent of successful mastery of skills. Mastery for the LEP group in the bilingual program exceeded the percentage of mastery for the population at large in the skill areas of numbers, operations, and applications; geometry; measurement; and problem solving. This data appears in Table 2.

TABLE 2

PERCENT OF PUPILS PASSING MATHEMATICS SKILLS OBJECTIVES
COMPARISON OF LEP PUPILS AND TOTAL TITLE I POPULATIONS
(CRITERION REFERENCED TEST RESULTS FOR 1978-79)

Skill Category	Total Population N	%	LEP Population N	%
Numbers, Operation and Application	125,617	75	22,994	78
Geometry	10,983	76	6,077	79
Measurement	20,401	74	9,143	75
Statistics and Probability	436	85	231	80
Sets	5,403	83	2,450	83
Functions and Graphs	2,453	70	921	68
Problem Solving	6,043	58	985	68
Total Math	171,656	75	42,801	77

B. ORAL LANGUAGE GROWTH IN CHAPTER 720-FUNDED BILINGUAL PROGRAMS (K-12)

The Bureau of Bilingual Education began a study of oral language growth in State-funded bilingual programs during the school year 1979-80. The initial stage of this evaluation study has assessed the growth in oral language skills in both English and the native language of the students that composed the sample. A total of thirteen school districts and 1,295 students in these districts were chosen as a representative sample that would allow for inferences to be made about the bilingual population as a whole. The thirteen districts were composed of eight community districts in New York City, two high school districts in New York City and three upstate New York districts. Table 3 shows the country or place of origin of the pupils that participated in the survey. Although the highest number of students come from Puerto Rico, this number is only about one third of the sample.

TABLE 3

COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN OF PUPILS IN BILINGUAL PROGRAMS IN SAMPLE DISTRICTS

Country of Origin	No. of Pupils In Sample	Percent
Puerto Rico	457	35
Dominican Republic	112	9
Cuba	17	1
Mexico	12	1
Colombia	70	5
Ecuador	68	5
Spain and Portugal	15	1
Italy	121	9
Greece	88	7
China and S.E. Asia	79	6
Lebanon	4	-
1/Other Central American	46	4
2/Other South American	97	8
Unspecified	109	9
	1295	100

1/includes Honduras, Guatamela, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nicaragua

2/includes Peru, Chile, Bolivia, Urguay, Argentina

The native languages of pupils in the samples is shown in Table 4. Approximately two-thirds of the pupils come from Spanish-language backgrounds.

TABLE 4

NATIVE LANGUAGE OF PUPILS IN SAMPLE

Native Language	Number of Pupils in Sample	Percent
Spanish	878	68
Italian	133	10
Greek	58	4
Chinese	62	5
Other (or missing)	164	13
Total	1295	100

An examination of the type of schools where the LEP population is enrolled indicates that the majority of sample students are "new" to English language instruction.

About 75% of the students participating in the study have been in schools where the predominant language of instruction is English for two years or less. (See Table 5)

TABLE 5

NUMBER OF YEARS SAMPLE PUPILS HAVE BEEN IN SCHOOLS WHERE PREDOMINANT LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION IS ENGLISH

Number of Years	Number of Pupils in Sample	Percent
Less than 1	239	18
1	437	34
2	298	23
3-5	165	13
6-10	92	7
Over 10	15	1
Missing	49	4
Total	1,295	100

Eighty percent of the sample pupils have been enrolled in bilingual programs for two years or less. Only two percent have been enrolled for more than five years. (See Table 6)

TABLE 6

NUMBERS OF YEARS SAMPLE PUPILS HAVE RECEIVED BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION

Number of Years	Number of Pupils in Sample	Percent
Less than 1	68	5
1	651	50
2	322	25
3-5	177	14
6-10	28	2
Missing	49	4
Total	1,295	100

The ability to use oral language was tested with the sample pupils. In English, the average oral language score increased from 52.0 to 70.2 in a six-month period between the pre- and posttests. Table 7 shows the gains. The number of pupils decreased between pretest and posttest because a portion of the sample population was not available during the posttest.

TABLE 7

AVERAGE ORAL LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT SCORES (ALL GRADES, ALL SAMPLE DISTRICTS)

Language	Pretest	No. of Pupils	Posttest	No. of Pupils
English	52.0	1,188	70.2	837
Native Language	48.7	1,069	58.6	728

Average Number of Months Between Pre and Posttest = 6 Months

In order to limit the findings to only those students who were present for both the pretest and posttest, a set of test scores for only those students who were present for both the pretest and posttest was analyzed. When the scores for this group were analyzed, the average gain in oral English was 20 points. This was more than double the average gain in native language ability. Table 8 shows the gains in oral language scores for those students who were present for both tests.

TABLE 8

AVERAGE GAINS IN ORAL LANGUAGE SCORES
(ALL PRE AND POST PAIRED SCORES)

Language	No. of Pupils	Average Gain Pre- to Post
English	832	20.3
Native Language	723	9.1

Average Number of Months Between Pre and Posttest = 6 Months

A Comparison of scores of oral language ability in English with oral language ability in the native language shows that the LEP pupils gain in English. On the pretest, 53% of the pupils had English scores higher than native language scores. On the posttest, this percentage increased to 73% of the pupils. This indicates that the pupils are improving their oral skills in English at a greater rate than in their native languages.

When the scores from the Spanish-speaking students are separated from the sample population studied, they show an improvement in English over their native language that is greater than that of the rest of the population participating in the study. Among Spanish-speaking pupils, 55% had English language scores higher than native language scores on the pretest and this percentage increased to 78% on the posttest.

TABLE 9

DIFFERENCE IN ORAL LANGUAGE SCORES
BETWEEN ENGLISH AND NATIVE LANGUAGE

Test	% For All Pupils	No. of Pupils	% For Spanish Speakers Only	# of Pupils
Pretest	53%	1,017	55%	796
Posttest	72%	804	78%	578

C. REVIEW OF TITLE VII AND CHAPTER 720 EVALUATION REPORTS 1978-79 (ELEMENTARY)

The Department reviewed 1978-79 final evaluation reports received from 50 ESEA Title VII and 18 Chapter 720 projects at the elementary or middle school levels. Fifteen of the evaluation reports examined contained serious problems in instrumentation and reporting techniques and could not be analyzed further. The Department analyzed and summarized twenty-eight ESEA Title VII and nine Chapter 720 reports. Of the 35 reports providing data on reading in English, 22 reported significant gains in reading achievement in English. Of the 22 reports providing information on mathematics instruction in English, 13 reported achieving significant gains.

D. REVIEW OF TITLE VII AND CHAPTER 720 EVALUATION REPORTS 1978-79 (SECONDARY)

The Department reviewed 1978-79 final evaluation reports for 20 high school bilingual projects in New York City which served the following languages: Spanish, Italian, Chinese, Arabic, Haitian-Creole and Yiddish. Of twelve projects which provided data on reading in English, all reported positive gains. Of twelve projects which provided data on achievement in mathematics through English instruction, nine reported positive gains. The high school projects also reported positive accomplishments in other areas. Seventeen of 20 projects reported that attendance by students in bilingual programs exceeded that of the monolingual school population at all grade levels. All seven projects reporting on school retention indicated that bilingual program drop-out rates were less than their overall high school rates.

Of the nine programs reporting on college-bound pupils, seven indicated a higher rate of students in the bilingual program accepted by colleges than from the school population as a whole.

IV. Summary and Recommendations

Bilingual/English as a Second Language programs are permissible under New York State Education Law. Although New York State Certification for bilingual and ESL teachers will be effective in September, 1983, New York City and Buffalo license bilingual teachers and New York City licenses English as a Second Language teachers. Bilingual/ESL program characteristics differ in school districts throughout the State since programs are governed by a variety of funding regulations. Federal- and State-funded programs currently serve 127,000 students from homes in which one or more of 29 languages is spoken.

A review of the evaluation reports for variously funded programs shows the following:

- 22 of 35 Title VII and Chapter 720 elementary school programs reported significant gains in English reading achievement, and 13 of 22 reported significant gains in mathematics when measured in English.

- 17 of 20 Title VII high school bilingual programs reported that attendance by students in bilingual programs exceeded that of the school population in the English monolingual programs.

- 7 of 7 Title VII high school bilingual programs reporting indicated that bilingual program drop-out rates were less than for monolingual high school students.

- 7 of 9 Title VII high school bilingual programs reported that a higher percentage of students in the bilingual program were accepted at colleges than in the total school population.

- Limited English Proficient students surpassed the general population's mastery of the subskills of structural analysis, vocabulary and study skills as measured on English criterion-referenced tests.

- LEP students demonstrated a higher percentage of objective mastery than the total school population on 5 skill areas of mathematics in English.

- Title I/PSEN LEP students demonstrated percentages of skills mastery in five English reading skills categories comparable to that of the school population at large, as measured on English criterion-referenced tests.

- LEP students demonstrated an average gain of 20 points between pre- and posttesting in English oral skills in State funded bilingual programs.

- 80 percent of the sample pupils in the study Oral Growth in Chapter 720 State Funded Programs have been in bilingual programs for two years or less.

Recommendations

1. Conduct annual census of limited English proficient students.

2. Develop and promulgate minimum State standards for educational programs serving students of limited English proficiency.

3. Develop and promulgate minimum State standards for evaluating programs for students of limited English proficiency.

4. Conduct a longitudinal study on the achievement of students in bilingual education programs.

APPENDIX A

STATE AND FEDERAL PROGRAMS FUNDED FOR STUDENTS OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

ESEA I/PSEN - Title I/PSEN provides supplementary or remedial services under seven priority areas: reading, bilingual reading, mathematics, bilingual mathematics, writing, bilingual writing, and English as a second language. Funding for these services is provided to economically deprived and educationally disadvantaged pupils under ESEA Title I - P.L. 95-561 and Pupils with Special Educational Needs (PSEN) - New York State Chapter 241. Eligibility for services is determined by poverty criteria, standardized tests and the New York State Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP) tests. This funding may be used for administrative, direct instructional and support services.

ESEA I Migrant - Title I Migrant provides tutorial instruction to non-English speaking and limited English proficient students in native languages reading and English as a second language. Instruction is provided by teaching assistants. Eligible students are classified as migrants by the New York State Migrant Census Office.

ESE IV-C - Title IV-C has four stages: a program is developed, validated and effective and transferable, demonstrated to other school districts within New York State, and then replicated by New York State school districts which have needs addressed by the program. The Department consults a State advisory council in determining the various priority areas under which funding is granted. The priority areas that have been established for FY-81 by the Advisory Council are: Improving Education Through the Arts, Education of Children with Handicapping Conditions, Dropout Prevention, Discipline, and Civic Education.

ESEA VII Basic Grants - Title VII basic grants are provided by the Federal Department of Education directly to school districts. The grants provide funding for services that support a district's bilingual education program.

ESEA VII Training Grants - Title VII training grants are provided directly to institutions of higher education or a nonprofit private organization by the Federal Department of Education. These grants are used to train bilingual teachers, paraprofessionals and other educational personnel.

EESEA VII Fellowship Grants - Title VII fellowship grants are provided by the Federal Department of Education to post-master students sponsored by an institution of higher eduction.

ESEA VII Bilingual Education Service Centers Grants - Title VII centers are funded to serve school districts within regions established by the Federal Department of Education. These centers provide bilingual education technical assistance to school districts within their regions. There is one center in New York City for the city's school districts. Another center, housed in Washington, D.C., provides services to all other districts in the State.

ESEA VII Material Development Centers Grants - Title VII centers are funded by the Federal Department of Education. These centers develop instructional and teacher training materials for bilingual education programs. One center exists in New York City to service the entire State.

Chapter 720 - Chapter 720 of Laws of 1973 provides aid to school districts with significant numbers of public school pupils of limited English proficiency (LEP) in grades K-12. Each year school districts apply for funding on a competitive basis. Proposals identify LEP students to be served, language(s) of instruction, subject areas to be taught, and the type of direct service instruction for which funding is requested. Only districts providing bilingual and ESL instruction to LEP students are funded.

Indochinese Refugee Act - This Federal act provides funds to be distributed on a fixed formula basis to school districts that have Indochinese Refugee students aged 5 to 17. The funds support basic and/or supplementary educational programs for eligible refugee students. The funds are administered by the State.